UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Shall We Stand by the President?

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The New Germany

By THEODOR HAHN

When Daniel Webster Was Secretary of State

By EDWIN D. MEAD

What Made the Dark Ages Dark?

By RALPH CHEYNEY

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 18

Chicago, July 10, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
FREDERICK STARR
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 279
Shall We Stand by the President?—ALSON H. ROBINSON 281

ARTICLES—

The New Germany—THEODOR HAHN 283
When Daniel Webster Was Secretary of State—EDWIN D. MEAD 284
What Made the Dark Ages Dark?—RALPH CHEYNEY 287

POETRY—

Union Square at Night—JOSEPH LEISER 282
O Let the Flag of Strife Be Furled—GEORGIANA BOLE KING ... 282

THE STUDY TABLE—

Joseph Chamberlain: First Phase—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 290
English Radio Talks—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 291

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Humanist Manifesto—JOHN T. RICKETT 291
Hitler an Idealist!—GERTRUDE VON PETZOLD 292

THE FIELD—

An Open Letter to the President—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 278

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Open Letter to the President

President Franklin D. Roosevelt,
White House,
Washington, D. C.

Dear President Roosevelt:

As one who has been nourished by the salt of the United States, both physical and spiritual, for the last twelve years, I wish to express my hearty gratitude to you for your signal services in uplifting America from the morass of despondency and in exalting this great nation to her rightful place as the leader of mankind. Though denied the right to become a citizen, only temporarily I hope, I look upon America as my spiritual Motherland and venerate her as much as my own beloved Motherland, India.

My heart is filled with joy that you should sound a clarion call to your own people and to the people of the world at this critical juncture in human affairs and once again enunciate the historic role of this democracy decreed by Providence. Overthrow of autocracy and overthrow of the war system—or, positively stated, democracy by popular representation and peace by outlawry of war—these are the two objectives Divine Providence has in mind for America to achieve.

The Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, is a source of inspiration to all mankind. "The moral equivalent for war" (William James), "peaceful revolution by non-payment of taxes," (Thoreau), "Civil Disobedience" (Thoreau), "the Outlawry of War," (Levinson and Borah), Kellogg-Briand Pact of Peace, "non-recognition of territory acquired by force" (Stimson), "pacts of non-aggression" guaranteeing the sending of "no armed force of whatsoever nature across their frontiers" (F. D. R.)—these typically American phrases, concepts and techniques have overnight become the priceless legacy of humanity.

I hope your admonition to the nations that "they will send no armed force of whatsoever nature across their frontiers" is applicable with equal validity to the armed forces of the great powers now stationed in subject lands. I have specifically in mind the armed forces of Japan in China and the armed forces of Britain in India.

Lest it be too late before well-meaning but inexperienced American diplomacy is bamboozled by the crafty diplomats of imperialist nations, I wish to emphasize at this early stage that reservations, of whatsoever nature, to your peace plan would sound the death-knell of world peace. By not joining the League of Nations as evolved in "the den of thieves" at Versailles, America effectively checked the complete stranglehold of subject countries by imperialist nations. It would be far more honorable for you and for this nation to repudiate your message to the rulers of the world of May 16, 1933, than that you should accept any reservations to it proposed, or likely to be proposed, by any of

(Continued on page 292)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, JULY 10, 1933 • Number 18

MY CREED

Shall we not open the human heart,
Swing the doors till the hinges start;
Stop our worrying, doubt, and din,
Hunting heaven and dodging sin?
There is no need to search so wide,
Open the door and stand aside—
Let God in!

Shall we not open the human heart,
To loving labor in field and mart;
Working together for all about
The good large labor that knows not doubt?
Can He be held in our narrow rim?
Do the work that is work for Him—
Let God out!

Shall we not open the human heart,
Never to close and stand apart?
God is a force to give way to!
God is a thing you have to do!
God can never be caught by prayer,
Hid in your heart and fastened there—
Let God through!

—*Charlotte Perkins Gilman.*

One minister after another was summoned to try his hand at the job, but none of them could suggest anything more than temporary palliatives . . . gigantic loans, which ostensibly paid off the previous ones; reckless and excessive taxation; the withdrawal of gold from circulation, and a frantic use of the printing-presses to create what for a time would masquerade as money; in a word, preposterous inflation.

It is thus that Stefan Zweig, in his new biography of Marie Antoinette, describes the desperate and futile financial measures taken by the French ministers of Louis XVI, in an attempt to stave off the Revolution. His enumeration is terrifying, since it is the story, as he himself points out, "with which post-war finance has made so many of the countries of Europe too painfully familiar." But it is also terrifying as anticipating precisely the measures taken by Mr. Roosevelt to meet the financial crisis in this country. Zweig's paragraph might well be a description not of the policies of Paris a century and a half ago, but of the policies of Washington at this moment. That these policies will accomplish anything, we cannot believe—"since history repeats itself," says Zweig! Which brings us to our point—that it is the financial measures of the Roosevelt administration which are bad, so bad that they threaten to wreck everything that the President is so wisely and bravely undertaking in other directions. The President's real statesmanship is being shown in the industrial, or more strictly economic, field. Here he is proving himself resourceful, creative, far-seeing, and thorough-going. We think these measures, if strictly carried out, may save the state. It is not too late! But meanwhile these financial counsels of desperation—all tried out before, and always with disastrous results—are being now tried out again. They will wreck everything if not controlled or stayed. Nothing, to our mind, is more exciting than this conflict between destructive and constructive forces right inside the present administration.

We agree with the President that his Industry Control Bill is an epoch-making piece of legislation—epoch-making for what it promises as well as for what it actually is. Take, for example, the matter of shorter hours and higher wages! It is obvious, to anybody who has eyes to see, that there is no possibility of ending unemployment except upon the basis of cutting the working day to six, four, even three hours, and thus absorbing the idle workers. Our unemployment at this moment, in other words, is due not merely to the breakdown of a system of production, but also to the very nature of that system of production itself. Much of our unemployment is "technological"—a part of our present machine process of industry. Our labor-saving devices and immense productive capacity have ended all possibility of employing workers on the old basis, even in a cooperative society. As conservative a man as Mr. Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, said the other day that, if we returned at once to the 1928-29 level of prosperity, not less than 5,000,000 men would still be out of work. So we must shorten the working day, and thus share employment. But at the same time we must raise wages, or at least maintain them at the 1928-29 level, for all this largely increased number of employees. We must pay the four-hour worker, that is, as much as we used to pay the eight-hour worker. At the same time, to protect the worker as consumer, we must fix prices. But how can this be done? Why, it *can't* be done under the old system, with interest on loans, investments, and *profits,* a first charge upon production. If the employer is taken care of in the good old-time fashion, in other words, the employee will *not* be taken care of, the consumer will *not* be protected, there

will be no increase in purchasing power, and the system will clog and stop almost as soon as it is started again. What must happen, if high wages and equitable prices are to accompany shorter hours, is that profits must be eliminated as a first charge upon industry. The wealth produced must go to the workers who produce it. But this is Socialism! *Exactly!!* The momentous thing about the President's program is the fact that, if it is to succeed, it must develop far beyond itself into a socialized order of civilization!

The announcement that President Roosevelt has consented to the building of some thirty odd new ships for the navy is the most disquieting news that has come out of Washington since March 4th. It is particularly disquieting because it is well known that it is on this navy side of his thought and life that Mr. Roosevelt is most weak. His resolute determination to cut down the army and navy expenditures in the interest of economy was one of his fine achievements, especially as his interest in both branches of the service was well known. But this business of new ships goes far toward dissipating all the good effects of what has thus far been done. Nor can we see that the arguments for naval construction have any validity! The talk about employment is something worse than silly, as there is nothing gained in putting men to work on unproductive enterprises. This is all of a piece with the barbarous idea that a good war just now would solve our whole problem of unemployment. So it would! But to what ultimate end of any good? If the only way we can keep men at work is to set them fighting, or building instruments of death and destruction, then the sooner we quit this whole business of civilization the better. Equally unsound, and also wicked, is the contention that we need this increase of naval force to give us bargaining power at disarmament conferences. The old argument of Brennus, the Gaul, when he flung his sword into the scales and by its weight determined the price of peace for Rome! Imagine increasing our navy as a first step toward asking other countries to decrease their fighting forces! But that's the way the military mind works—and that's the reason, incidentally, why disarmament parleys, and wars to end war, and all the rest, never get anywhere. Force is *not* the way to peace. When will the earth learn this basic truth? As we look over the world today we can find nothing so distressing as the spectacle of an impoverished world still spending its depleted substance for armaments on land and sea. The President should not have compromised with this madness, but set his face like flint against it.

We have more than once expressed the wish in these columns that William Jennings Bryan were alive. This is his hour. America off the gold standard; America repudiating gold payments; America well started on inflation! What is this but exactly the thing that "the boy orator of the Platte" both urged and prophesied? And the railroad reorganization and consolidation, what is this but the very policy that the Nebraskan advocated in his declaration in favor of what he rather loosely called the government ownership of railroads? But sweetest of all in revenge upon his enemies is the guarantee of bank deposits, so specifically and sweepingly provided for in the new financial legislation. This was Bryan's rankest heresy in the good old days when he was ridiculed and denounced and feared by all respectable and respected citizens. Nothing could be more outrageous than his suggestion that the government should assume responsibility for the security of the money of a bank depositor. This was making the good bank pay the penalty of the folly or flat dishonesty of the bad bank. It was making the government "hold the bag" for all kinds of delinquencies in banking policy. It was—well, all sorts and kinds of dreadful things which proved Mr. Bryan a madman, a mountebank, a menace to the integrity and honor of the nation. But lo, the years have flown, and here is Washington solemnly enacting into legislation the very measure which thus stirred the scandal and shame of men. As to the precise merits of the question of the guarantee of bank deposits, we do not undertake to enter at this time. But we would point out, as a simple matter of historic justice, that Mr. Bryan's "rejected" stone has now become "the headstone of the corner." Also, we would record our conviction that the millions of bank depositors in this country never breathed so easy as they do now that this legislation has been enacted, and the banks themselves were never quite so safe. Mr. Roosevelt would seem to have done not so badly in following in Mr. Bryan's footsteps.

The reversal of the conviction of the Negro, Patterson, in the famous Scottsboro case, is the best news that has come out of America for many a long day. There is justice in Alabama, after all! The South can rise to the challenge of simple decency and truth even in the case of ignorant, friendless, and helpless Negroes. The decision of the appellate judge, handed down a fortnight or so ago is a model of lucidity, and an instance of high courage. In words unsparing in their indictment of the trial in the lower court, this judge declares that the testimony of the chief witness against the Scottsboro boys, a vagabond prostitute, was in its very essence dubious, that it had no corroboration of any kind, and that it was openly contradictory to other and convincing testimony. In the opinion of the higher court, in other words, there is no reason for believing the Scottsboro boys guilty, and no basis, therefore, for the verdict of the jury. This verdict

was simply a part of the blind and stupid popular prejudice that has surrounded this case from the beginning. That an Alabama court asserts this fact and thus rescues these Negroes from the awful fate impending upon them, is a source of almost infinite gratification. An occurrence of this kind renews one's faith in the American system of justice (badly shaken in recent years), stirs afresh one's belief in democracy (also badly shaken), and reestablishes one's confidence in men. There is such a thing, after all, as meeting the ferocity of mad fanaticism with the simple institutions of organized social life. Prejudice even under the worst circumstances can sometimes be overborne by truth. But why not always? If a southern judge can justify these Scottsboro boys, why could not a Massachusetts judge justify Sacco and Vanzetti? If Alabama can release the Negro, Patterson, why can't California release the labor leader, Mooney? We would hardly have thought of this state, Alabama, as the one destined to save the honor of the republic, but it has done so!

It is curious how unwilling people are to believe the truth about Adolf Hitler. They despise and fear this man, and therefore simply refuse to recognize what is going on. Was there ever such a case of wishful thinking? In the days before the Nazi leader's ascendancy to power, for example, the public inside of Germany and out ignored and derided him. When his movement was sweeping on with unprecedented speed and power, people laughed at the idea of his ever gaining office. Now that he has become the dictator of the destinies of more than sixty millions of people, the mood of incredulity still continues. Americans rest comfortably in the assurance that Hitler will not retain his power, or will not use it—that these events of the last few months are only a kind of night-mare, which will straightway pass. With such inanity as this, it is hard to be patient. Why fool ourselves about such a momentous situation as this of Germany and Europe? Hitler is in office to stay. He means what he says, and will do what he has promised. He is now consolidating his power by sweeping away all opposition to the Nazi rule; and, this job done, he will face the world with a challenge which will shake foundations. It is useless to think that anybody is going to hold out against him in the Reich, or that any group or party can make headway against him. He has smashed and utterly destroyed the trade unions. He has suppressed the Communists; and outlawed the Social Democrats. He has dissolved the Steel Helmets, and thus wiped out the Hugenberg Nationalists who assisted him into office. He has dissolved the Boy Scouts and other youth organizations, and placed all the young people of the land under Nazi control. He has scattered the Jews, taken over the universities, and declared war on the churches. These churches, Protestant and Catholic alike, have tried to resist him, and have failed. All of which is discouraging, distressing, ghastly, terrifying, but unhappily and indisputably *true!* Our first duty is to recognize these facts as basis for thought and action.

Shall We Stand by the President?

The metaphors of war are wholly appropriate to such a period as the present. To be sure the President himself appears to prefer those of the athletic field, and he brings his long statement on the National Recovery Act to a close by an appeal to "move as one great team to victory." But it's all a little more serious than this. For the most part games are played for the fun of it, but whatever formation results from the activities of the people of this and other countries during the next few months, back of it all will still be the shadow of starvation, and the spectacle of sidewalks littered with the household effects of dispossessed families.

One doesn't play with such situations as this. Mr. Roosevelt himself doesn't. He demonstrated as much during the closing hours of Congress when he said in substance to such disaffected members of his party as were doubtful about the Economy bill that they had better support this measure or they might be sorry when the patronage is passed around. Difficulties also arose during those days of feverish activity in Washington when for the first time in many months the forlorn remnants of the republican party found themselves in a position to declare their ancient solidarity.

But for the next few months the test of loyalty to the President is not a matter of Congressional support. In some instances eagerly, in others grudgingly, for better or worse, the representatives of the people have placed certain great instruments in the hands of a single man, to act, within limits, as he deems wise and desirable. From now on the question is whether the masses of the people themselves will give aid and comfort in the employment of those instruments.

It may be that we shall have to go through all the motions and devices which were resorted to during the World War. Already a movement has been started in the public schools towards the elimination of neutrality on the part of our school population and regimentation in support of the entire program of the President. Well, why not? Granting the inevitability of many abuses, that even at this early stage it is not well to mention kit bags, or civil service requirements, even so this war has so much of promise to it of better things that the end may justify the means even with those of us to whom patriotic devices ordinarily bring offense.

So much has happened since the fourth of March that we need, as Mrs. Roosevelt said to the women of the country the other day in referring to the economic conference, "to be on our toes to get what is happening every minute of the time." That is asking too much, but at least we can stand by the President to the ex-

tent of keeping in mind some of the most important implements which Congress has put in his hands.

That it means standing by in a big way there can be no doubt. Some of us will do it in the act which made beer a legal beverage—in spite of the fact that up to the present moment neither the extravagant hopes nor the paralyzing fears have materialized. Our friends in the Middle West will stand by as the Farm Relief Bill takes away a billion or so dollars from three-fourths of the people, and pays it to the other one-fourth. The Securities Bill will appeal to the imagination and justice of those who were not included in the favored list of the House of Morgan, in spite of the fact that it seems to have locked the door after the horse is stolen. The Wagner Bill for direct relief, however inadequate, will appeal to those, whether victims or not, who have felt the humiliation of the private dole.

With so many measures in the offing, each of us may stand by the President in his own way. But after our individual choice has been made, the Industrial Recovery Bill remains as the common imperative from which there seems to be no appeal. The weeks and months have dragged into years as we have feebly tried to get this wretched patient, which we call Industry, at least into a condition of convalescence.

At last we have a plan for doing so. It is a covenant to ban starvation wages, to enable employers to act cooperatively, if they have it in them to do so, and to enable labor to bargain collectively. Presently the hearings will begin on the various codes which the industries and labor organizations of the country have been empowered to formulate. Then we shall see what it means, and what is required to stand by the President.

The impression has been spread abroad that this Industrial Recovery Bill is the most revolutionary measure ever adopted by an American Congress. At any rate we have a plan—not a five year plan as they had, and still have in Russia, but a two year plan, for this period marks the termination of extraordinary power granted to the President under this measure. If the thing works out, as we hope it will, some of us may feel sorry that we made so many unkind remarks about the Russian plan, and start a campaign to finish our two year plan in sixty days. That would be a reasonable demonstration of American enterprise.

Many there will be who while reluctant to have their patriotism called into question will argue that you can't have a plan in our kind of society. The answer is that whether we like it or not, there is now no such thing any longer as "our kind of society." With the enactment of the Recovery Bill capitalism in its hitherto characteristic form is hereby suspended. The principle of laissez-faire, or the private control of business is dead. In place of it we shall have not socialism, but state capitalism, and after that, who knows what? When Mr. Roosevelt in his commentary on the Recovery Act said that it "represents a supreme effort to stabilize for all time the many factors which make for the prosperity of the nation," he was speaking with the assurance of one who confuses a brave word with the last word.

There would seem to be plenty of ways, therefore, for the individualist, if any such remain, to stand by the President. Mrs. Roosevelt, who is herself manifesting wisdom, as well as the ability to travel, has emphasized the need to keep track of what is going on. Perhaps even now that race between education and catastrophe upon which Mr. H. G. Wells once said the future of civilization is dependent may not be lost.

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Union Square at Night

I have seen in Union Square
Shining miracles as rare
As the needle pointed Empire
Guiding planes down lanes of air.

There I saw a raft of men
Search the Park to lay them down
Pillowed by a late edition,
Tossed profusely on the town.

Peering here and there intently
For an unobstructed spot
On the lumpy, ploughed upheaval
Of this honored grassy plot,

Now maliciously distorted
Lest a hobo make his bed
With a tabloid for a mattress
And the comics for a spread.

I have seen in Union Square
Scores of human beings sleeping
In whose dreams all hope expired
Like lost souls through hell fire—creeping,

While the mists hung low to sting
With a sharp and piercing prong,
And the trolleys clanged, the whole night through,
Noisily, a brassy song.

And I asked myself in wonder:
Is it right that men should sprawl
On the rough, uneven surface
Of a city park at all?

When along the canyoned avenues
Empty rooms for tenants wait
Willingly to serve the homeless
Tripped along the paths of fate.

It may be the stars are wiser,
Twinkling with ironic glare
On the men asleep of nights—
Dispossessed—in Union Square.

JOSEPH LEISER

O Let the Flag of Strife Be Furled

Too much of hate is in the world,
Too much of base ambition;
O let the flag of strife be furled
And hearts bowed in contrition.

Let nations cease their enmity
And war and lust be done,
That men may walk in ecstasy
And learn to face the sun.

Let brother reach to brother hands
Across the restless sea,
Amalgamating laws and lands
In love's sweet unity.

Then shall the sound of singing rise
Above the cannon's roar,
And under calm and sunny skies
We shall be glad once more.

GEORGIANA BOLE KING.

The New Germany*

[From Our Special Correspondent]

The message of Adolf Hitler regarding disarmament has shown the world that it here has a statesman to reckon with, whose high ideals are not to be questioned. Some say that this is a new Hitler. It may be true. Or it may be that it was first necessary for Hitler to assume command of affairs in Germany before he could give expression to those ideals which he has long had in mind and is now trying to put into practice. At all events, the new regime in Germany is hard at work and the regulations which are being put into effect at present show that a really new order is coming into being. It has often been said that "there is nothing new under the sun," and yet this "new order," this "third kingdom," which is now gradually evolving out of the old Germany, is indeed something new. Not new, it is true, in the sense that the ideas are all new, but new in the sense that it is the first time that these ideas are being put into practice in a European country. For one must not forget that the attitude toward life in general and toward the individual in particular is quite different in the Old World and the New. The Old World is still hampered by tradition and this tradition finds expression largely in class distinctions, in a gulf between employer and employee, in the distance which is upheld between the employee of the state (the official) and the mass of the population.

The Hitler-regime is doing away with old worn-out lines of thought with a single stroke of the pen. Conditions which broad-minded people of Germany have long desired, are suddenly realized as actually practicable. On May 1st all class-distinctions were eradicated by the announcement that this day was to be a day of union between all classes, between employer and employee, etc. In order to give public expression to this new state of affairs, parades were held in every city and town of Germany, in which all workers, both of the brain and of the hands, employers together with their employees, took part. The writer, as partner in a vegetable oil factory, marched in the parade held in his native city with the workers of his factory and his office-staff. Many factories and businesses had large floats, showing their wares. A typical part of the parade in every city was that of the Guilds, many of which still hold to traditions which date back to the Middle Ages, such as the costumes which members of the Guild wear. The floats showing these various Guilds at work were instructive, interesting and most picturesque. Never before has Germany, in city, town and country, been so lavishly decorated with flags. And in addition, garlands of fresh green, young birch trees, sprays of beech-trees, branches of pine and fir, were used as decorations on street-cars, railroad locomotives, auto-buses, etc. Private cars were flagged and decorated, so that the streets everywhere presented a picture of gayety and festivity. For the Germans were celebrating the tearing down of barriers which for centuries had acted as hindrances to their inner freedom. Of course, the purpose of this day was to break down all social barriers so that they cannot be erected again. One must wait and see whether this can really be accomplished. At all events, the feeling of union and of national pride has been strengthened to a very great degree and will doubtless remain and increase as the weeks go by.

Emphasis is being laid on *"German"* institutions. Jazz is being replaced by the more satisfying music of which Germany has such a generous measure. Libraries are being cleared of "trash" literature, and in the theaters the classics are being brought forth again. The radio is entirely in the hands of the new party. In many restaurants signs have been hung up with the message: "The German woman does not smoke," which is already making many women realize that after all smoking is not a necessary habit. The sport-clubs are taking up hiking and are planning to leave feats of skill, such as making records and competing for prizes, to those other nations who wish to share such honors. All sorts of clubs, societies, and associations, be they of a musical, literary, social, or whatever nature, are being reorganized, they are undergoing what is called *"Gleichschaltung."* This term is taken from the technical world, it means to have the same current for everything, not to have a 110 volt current for one and a 220 volt current for another, but to have the same current for all. And translated into the political field, this means in Germany that today the main current that controls everything, be it in politics, social relations, education, theater, music, business,—all must have the same current, and this is that of the National Socialistic German Workers Party. Their slogan is "The benefit to all is above the benefit to the individual." The interests of the many must be disregarded in order to further the interests of those who have been most severely hit by the past years of depression. For instance, in families where several members are earning, one or more of these must leave his position in order to make room for someone who has been out of employment for months and perhaps years. Pensions which are being paid to retired officials, who are earning money "on the side" will be withdrawn, unless this other occupation is given up. In cases where both husband and wife are employed, the wife must give up her position to make room for some unemployed man. In industries where over-production has flooded the market, restriction is enforced as to the output, so as to make room for some other branch which has been laid low. It is socialism of the highest order put into actual practice.

The name of the ruling party in Germany is perhaps unfortunately long. But each word is full of significance and indicates the program which this party wishes to put into effect. The propaganda used in this movement is very splendid. It is the best advertising that the modern world has yet seen and experienced. The plans are carefully worked out to the smallest detail and when they are presented to the public everything is fixed and finished. First, the new party stressed the word *"National."* Germany should again realize her dignity as a nation. Her people should do away with the belief that there is a Prussia, a Bavaria, a Württemberg, a Saxony, etc. They should feel that they are all one nation, and that the *German* nation. The old flag of black-white-red should again float over

*This article, by our German correspondent, is of momentous interest and importance as showing the attitude of German citizens toward Hitler and the Nazis. The overwhelming popular support of Hitler is an aspect of the present situation which may not be safely ignored.—Editor.

Germany, the union which was brought about by Bismarck and which had lapsed into a sort of disinterestedness in national affairs should again be bound firmly together. Thousands of Germans, tired of the strife caused by the dozens of political parties of the past years, rallied to this call. They felt that Germany needed a "national spirit" in order to cope with the outside world and the economic problems that are world problems.

Then, after the national spirit had been stressed, the word *socialist* was placed in the foreground. There should be a feeling of brotherhood, of comradeship. Each one should work for the good of all, the advantage of the individual should be placed in the background, so that the greater number might have the greater good. The class-distinction should be eradicated, so that every individual German might feel himself as an important member of the German state. This appealed to another large group of Germans, to those who felt that they were in some way prevented from living up to their highest hopes because of a disadvantage of birth and education.

Then attention was called to the word *"Worker."* This, the Germans were told, does not mean a common laborer, as was for so many centuries the general opinion. No, the worker is he who is busy about his own and his country's business, be he a worker with the hands or with the brain. All are workers and all must work, in order that the new order may be successful in carrying out its ideals. And for the vast number of unemployed, means must and will be found, by which to give them the opportunity to work for the common weal. No wonder that the workers of all kinds, especially those out of employment, flocked to the Hitler standard and are wildly enthusiastic about the new order that is now on the way to fulfilment.

Adolf Hitler has won the respect of many because of his utter honesty and simplicity. Although of humble origin, and absolutely a self-made man, he has remained unpretentious in his personal demands, even though he now is the most powerful man in Germany. He has one single purpose in mind,—to better conditions in Germany—and his entire energy of thought, mind and body, is being subjected to the carrying out of this purpose. He is of a very forceful character, commanding, expecting supreme obedience of his followers, and he himself sets the example of self-mastery in that he neither smokes nor drinks and is a vegetarian. In office Hitler has remained as modest as he always was by nature. When an honorary title was offered him recently by a German University, he declined this honor. He has repeatedly said that he wishes no title and that he wants his tombstone to bear only the name Adolf Hitler.

The atmosphere in Germany has in a few weeks changed remarkably. From a state of apathy, pessimism and discouragement, there has sprung up Phoenix-like a state of activity, optimism and courage. What a difference the mental attitude makes! So far the individual has not experienced any radical change in his affairs, such as in tax-paying, lack of money, and the high cost of living,—but at least he is going about his daily tasks with the light of hope in his eyes, with a new courage in his heart and with a conviction that the new government will somehow bring order out of chaos. And this changed attitude is in itself a great step forward.

It must not be supposed that everyone in Germany is at heart in accord with the new government. Naturally there are many who do not accede to the new plans, who see too much injustice being done to those who are of a different opinion, to be able to shout with the crowd. But a revolution has taken place and is still in the process of ferment, and perhaps these unfavorable aspects must be accepted as unavoidable. One thing to be everlastingly grateful for is that there has been almost no bloodshed, that the revolution has taken place without loss of life and with no destruction of property. It is, in first order, a spiritual revolution, a reshaping of values and the ushering in of a nationalistic, socialistic German regime, in which each member of the German nation is a worker, respected for his contribution to his country's welfare, so long as he works in accord with the principles laid down by Adolf Hitler.

THEODOR HAHN.

Heilbron, Germany.

When Daniel Webster Was Secretary of State

When Sir Austen Chamberlain, the former foreign secretary of Great Britain, spoke some sharp words in Parliament recently on the violent proceedings of the Hitler government at Berlin, especially as affecting European peace, that government remonstrated, declaring that the course of the German government was its own affair and comments by foreign statesmen were impertinent.

It is too late in the day for this sort of talk and for the assumption behind it. If it ever had warrant, that warrant ceased for all members of the League of Nations, whose covenant makes disorder and menace to peace anywhere the concern of all; and it ceased by implication for all nations which have adopted the Kellogg Peace Pact. No nation now stands to itself alone, but all are amenable to the public opinion of the world and its responsible spokesmen. As in this federal republic it is no breach of neighborliness for men in Massachusetts or Ohio to censure a government which condones lynching in Alabama or banditry in Chicago, so it is the right and often the duty of members of the great family of nations to denounce wrong against international order and human rights a thousand miles away or ten thousand miles. No *Tu quoque* shall scare us from our duty and the truth, in state, national or international affairs. We rejoice that when Roumania was in her barbarous course against the Jews in her population, it was John Hay, our Secretary of State, who proclaimed to her that America would not witness it without solemn protest. This action should be a commanding example for our nation and for every nation. Every sober and high minded American citizen welcomes sharp reproof from London, Paris or Berlin of social or political offences here. No nation can any longer escape this, but everyone is on its good behavior and stands at the bar of humanity, responsible for order, progress and propriety in its own place. Every civilized power has obligations and prerogatives in the common family, and every one has missionary rights and the right to plain speech. We need more of the spirit of Daniel Webster of 1851.

When the Hungarian revolution under Kossuth

failed in its struggle against Austrian tyranny, overwhelmed by the combined armies of Austria and Russia, Kossuth and his associates took refuge in Turkey. The Russian government demanded their surrender. Then (November 7, 1849) Daniel Webster spoke in Boston. He was not then Secretary of State, but Senator from Massachusetts. He said:

We have all had our sympathies enlisted in the Hungarian effort for liberty. We have all wept at its failure. Despotic power from abroad intervened to suppress the hope of free government in Hungary. The Emperor of Russia demands that the noble Kossuth and his companions shall be given up to be dealt with at his pleasure. Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power, and that is the aroused indignation of the civilized world. If the Emperor of Russia shall so violate international law as to seize these Hungarians and execute them, he will stand as a criminal malefactor in the view of the public law of the world. The whole world will be the tribunal to try him, and he must abide its judgment.

Zachary Taylor was then President of the United States. He did not wait for some Hungarian republican to get to the United States to tell of the situation. He believed that he interpreted aright the sympathy and the will of the American people by sending an agent to Hungary for accurate information about the progress of the revolution; and presently (1850) he avowed to Congress his intention to have acknowledged the independence of Hungary if she had succeeded in setting up a government of her own. The Austrian government was enraged. Its representative at Washington, Hulsemann, sent a vigorous protest to our government. This was just as President Taylor died and Millard Fillmore succeeded him and made Webster Secretary of State. It therefore fell to Webster to reply to the Austrian protest. His famous letter to Hulsemann was dated December 21, 1850; and it was a firm and thorough statement of the relation of the United States toward the people of other countries which might be seeking through successful revolution to establish free institutions which its people sanctioned. That was our right. Austria and Russia moreover, with the other autocracies of Europe, had during the American and French revolutions and the establishment of our republic exercised the privilege of warning their people against the new democratic ideas that were menacing the old order. We equally believed that the old autocratic system was a hindrance to human progress; and wherever we saw democratic aspirations and efforts emerging, we heartily greeted them, and so far as we could do so consistently with international obligations our people would always heartily support them.

Webster's emphatic utterance stirred the people to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, intensifying their already intense sympathy with the Hungarian republicans, and its effect in Europe was prodigious. Mr. Hulsemann at once resigned. This was a new turn in the language of diplomacy. Webster wrote to a friend,

If you say that my letter is boastful and rough, I shall not deny it. I thought it well enough to speak out and tell the people of Europe who and what we are.

He had written the draft of the letter in the white heat of the devotion to liberty and humanity in which Washington and Franklin and Jefferson laid the foundations of the republic. He held the principles of the Holy Alliance to be at war with the inviolable rights of mankind, and that the central principles of our own Declaration of Independence commanded us to declare this to the world.

Webster was not content with making speeches. He opened negotiations with the Turkish government at Constantinople, where Kossuth had taken refuge, and finally, in the teeth of Austrian and Russian opposition, secured its permission to the release of Kossuth for refuge in the United States, our government sending an American frigate to convey him.

Kossuth arrived in New York in October, 1851; and his stay in America was an uninterrupted triumph, paralleled only by the welcome to Lafayette twenty-five years before, in which also Webster took so conspicuous a part. Said Emerson, the spokesman for Concord, in welcoming him to that historic cradle of freedom:

The graves of our heroes around us throb today to a footstep that sounded like their own. The shores of Europe and America approach every month, and their politics will one day mingle. We see in you the foremost soldier of freedom in this age. You have achieved your right to interpret our Washington. It is not those who live idly in the city called after his name, but those who, all over the world, think and act like him, who can claim to explain the sentiment of Washington.

Kossuth was welcomed to the capital of the United States by the votes of the two houses of Congress. President Fillmore, who stood firmly with Webster in his whole course in the matter, received him most cordially and invited him to dinner; and Webster himself made the principal speech at the great Washington banquet.

We acclaim here (he said) the pleasure with which we receive him to the shores of this free land, this asylum of oppressed humanity. The effect of this reception can not but have its influence beyond the ocean, among countries where our principles and sentiments are generally unknown or generally disliked. Let it be borne on the winds of heaven that the sympathies of the government of the United States have been attracted towards a nation struggling for national independence and towards those of her sons who have most distinguished themselves in that struggle. Let it go out, let it be proclamed in thunder tones, let it open the ears of the deaf, let it open the eyes of the blind, let it be everywhere proclaimed what we of this great republic think of the principles of human liberty.

We had no wish to dictate to any people its form of government; we purposed no intervention in foreign conflicts; but if Hungary when she achieved her independence chose republican institutions like our own, it would be to us the source of profound satisfaction.

It is more than ever the right and the duty of lovers of freedom and justice in every land to make themselves felt in behalf of freedom and justice everywhere, and to help make the world safe for democracy. It behooves America especially to remember always the power of foreign reinforcement. Perhaps the most decisive battles in our Revolution were those waged by our friends in the British Parliament. Pitt "rejoiced that America had resisted." Horace Walpole "thanked God" for the news of Burgoyne's defeat at Saratoga; and Fox even declared that the ministers ought to be sent to the scaffold! Had these men been in America in 1917 and talked as they talked in England in 1775, they would all have been sent to prison. But England and America alike hold them today in highest honor.

It is four-score years since Webster spoke for Kossuth and the republican revolution in Hungary and as the champion of democracy for the world. Our Civil War was only ten years ahead. The World War is fifteen years behind. There is much in Europe today that the American democrat cannot sanction; but much of it he clearly sees is pathological, the aftermath of the war and its confusions, and he waits for

it to pass. His demand is still that the world must be made safe for democracy; and his faith is that only democracy is safe for the world. No despotism can now endure, whether it be despotism of an individual or of a cabal. The American people as a body, with slight dissent, have no use for socialism, communism or despotism, but stand faithfully and firmly for democracy, in sure confidence that their democratic system can always easily adjust itself to every situation and to every provision which common sense prescribes.

The American knows with Immanuel Kant, greatest thinker of Germany and of the modern world, that peace and freedom go together, and that there can be no permanent peace until the free nations control the world. As Webster's great concern was for democracy; our commanding duty is the establishment of the new international order through peace and freedom. It was no accident that the League of Nations was founded by our American President, and that the most influential member of the commission which organized the World Court was our revered Elihu Root, who as then our Secretary of State labored so strenuously for the establishment of that Court by the Second Hague Conference in 1907. Firm in his faith, he declares today that "the League of Nations and the World Court have in this time done immeasurably more for the peace and order of the world than any other agencies in the whole history of civilization"; and he waits quietly for their development and universal acceptance. Yet by the strangest and most mournful irony in history we are the one great civilized power which stands today outside the organized family of nations. We need not here recount the bitter partisanship which in 1920 affected the sad result; and we may never forget that it was possible only through the anomalous provision of our Constitution whereby, although war may be declared by a mere majority of congress, a peace treaty can be ratified only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. President Wilson in 1920 had the strong majority of the Senate, as he had the overwhelming sentiment of the country, behind him, but lacked the two or three votes requisite for the necessary two-thirds. The resulting mischief has been incalculable, as the Manchurian situation has so sharply illustrated; but surely it will not be long before we take our rightful place, the place prescribed by our history, our traditions and our federal system. Here is where our Secretary of State today may render righteous and imperative service.

Here we may not fail to pay the high tribute due to Secretary Stimson and President Hoover. Although sixty nations had adopted the Kellogg Peace Pact, which we sponsored, renouncing war and pledging the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, for which there is now complete provision in every possible case, there were those who still doubted whether the Peace Pact had "teeth." Secretary Stimson settled that. In his address in New York last autumn he declared that the American government viewed the Peace Pact as explicit and commanding, and that it absolutely reversed the status of those who sanctioned war and those who opposed it. Hitherto the war-makers had had law on their side; but now law was with the peace-makers, and those who sanctioned war and its results had become the lawless men. This he clinched by his official declaration, incident to the Manchurian controversy, that this government would henceforth recognize no acquisition of territory by force.

America and the world have awaited a declaration by the President or the Secretary of State on the question of the world's monstrous armaments as explicit as Secretary Stimson's declaration on the outlawry of war, and as eloquent and commanding as Daniel Webster on democracy. President Hoover said truly that it is vain to hope for prosperity so long as the nations continue wasting their substance on great armaments, now more a menace than a defence; and he rescued the Geneva disarmament conference from threatened impotence and failure by his sharp proposal that all nations at once cut down their armaments one-third. We should begin right there, and push on; and the noble address of President Roosevelt to the governments and people of the world, so strongly reinforced by Mr. Davis' speech at Geneva, fill all good men with hope.. The World War itself was the final and complete answer to the foolish but common contention that preparations for war are the best guarantee of peace; for never were nations so heavily armed as those which in 1914 plunged into the war. Their armaments were their undoing. Nobody planned war or wanted it. The nations, as Lloyd George so truly said in the cooler blood of the later time, "stumbled and staggered into it together"; and they did it because their war machinery was too much for them, and at a staggering cost, from which they will but slowly recover. England, we learn, in the four years and a half of war spent more than she had spent in two centuries and a half before the war; and so it was all along the line. Yet there are still those who wonder at the world's "depression" and that men and nations still feel exhaustion and the pinch of poverty.

The issue of the hour demands the explicitness of Hoover and Stimson; it demands the defiant energy of Daniel Webster. The place to bring these to bear today, the place for the reassertion of American leadership in world affairs, so sadly forfeited by our course towards the League of Nations and the World Court, is clearly in putting to an end the world's present burdensome and barbarous armaments system. This too is the implication and imperative of the Kellogg Peace Pact. The clear corollary of the provision of the instrumentalities for the peaceful and legal settlement of international disputes is the radical decrease in the instruments of war and force; and this should now be rapid. Yet wild big navy men in Congress proposed but yesterday that we appropriate $230,000,000 for more warships. They do not know the world they live in. I think they do not know the American people. The rival navies of the nations should now quickly be superseded by a small international naval force sufficient for the policing of the seas. The freedom of the seas should be absolute; and Americans may recall with proper pride that it was Franklin and Jefferson who together in 1785 drafted in Paris the treaty with Prussia which for the first time in history decreed the immunity of private property of the nations at sea in case of war.

The American people should make themselves heard at Washington, where the atmosphere seems clearing. They should make themselves heard at Geneva, where the International Disarmament Conference is now reassembled for final action. Our delegation there should take the leadership which the best old American spirit and the exigency of the hour com-

mand. When Webster spoke to Austria in 1851, the world's chancelleries felt that there was a new turn in the language of diplomacy. When his friends said that his language was rough he said, as we have noted "I thought it well to speak out." The world has waited for somebody to speak out with adequate impatience and adequate power on the now intolerable armaments system. Why indeed should it not be America? The world must be compelled to be true to itself. It is treasonable under the new international pledge for the nations to be trading in the machinery of war. In our own Congress there is objection to authorizing the President to declare an embargo on arms to any nation acting aggressively in war; but the Peace Pact itself constructively commands all nations unitedly to outlaw any export of arms or munitions of war by any nation under any circumstances at any time. The peace party and the loyal citizens of every country should resolutely insist upon this instant provision.

While gray-haired vested interests go on acting as if the Kellogg Peace Pact were to be ignored, it stirs the blood to hear the firm declaration of our government that it shall be absolutely observed; and stirring too is the mighty response of youth, at this moment especially among the students of the English and American universities, to the "No More War" crusade, joined already by thousands, emphasizing with new power that peace is now the law of the land and the law of mankind. No nation can longer stand to itself. Each day's despatches show anew that we are bound together and must act together. With a dozen nations in Europe paralyzed and embittered by high tariffs and commercial barriers, with all Europe and all nations suffering from this benighted policy, in which the course of our own nation has not been the least flagrant, it is heartening to recall the words of Washington declaring trade restrictions the occasion of constant hostility and of war, not befitting civilization; and when the talk is of Webster, we may not forget that his first speech when he entered Congress from Massachusetts in 1823 was a denunciation of a high tariff in our modern commercial world, with special stress upon its uselessness for the United States. Each day proclaims that tariffs and currency and all cognate things are matters which must now be settled internationally.

War is an anachronism; the machinery of war is an impertinence; isolation and a selfish nationalism are impossible; and the world's statesmanship must act decisively in recognition of these facts. The prophetic words of Washington call us now to resolute and sweeping action. "My first wish," he wrote, "is to see war, the plague of mankind, banished from the earth." Again he said, "I am a citizen of the republic of humanity."

EDWIN D. MEAD.

What Made the Dark Ages Dark?

There were no dark ages. Man has ever been feeling his way through lighter and lighter gray toward a gleam ahead.

All ages have been dark ages. For all ages have been dark compared with what man might achieve. There have been shadows cast across man's path from the beginning.

The dark ages are now. For shadows still lie upon your way and mine. Electric signs dazzle our eyes, but they are chiefly advertisements, and advertisements are signs of competition, greed-motivated commercial competition which is little less bitter although a bit more subtle than the competition of tearing claw and bloody fang.

By Dark Ages the older historians meant the period which followed the decline of the Roman Empire and preceded the Renaissance, an era when art and culture were at low ebb or existed only in the oases of monasteries and nunneries, the time from A. D. 300 to 1200. From 300 to 800 Europe was invaded by Goths, Vandals, Angles and Saxons, from 800 to 1,000 by Danes and others who swept down from the North, from 1000 to 1500 by Turks.

You can get some idea of the actual conditions of life in the Dark Ages by trying to imagine what another world war would probably mean to us now. It would be a war from the air with poison gases suffocating entire cities, not scattered wars on land fought almost hand-to-hand. Most of what we own and are would be wiped out and most of the rest toppled into ruins. It would be a far darker age than were the Dark Ages for science has progressed further in power to destroy than to create. It has been declared that gunpowder brought civilization. To quote Hendrik Willem Van Loon,

> The first great blow for the independence of the individual was struck with the invention of gunpowder. After the year 1300 the possession of gunpowder meant pretty much what the possession of money in the bank means today.

But gunpowder and the other implements of warfare for which it stands as a symbol may now destroy civilization. The attention which the Greeks and Romans paid to war accounted in large measure for the downfall of the civilizations they built. Will it cause the downfall of our civilization, such as it is?

You can get an idea of the mental state of Europeans during the Dark Ages by thinking what life would be like if only the most superstitious and ignorant people survived another world war to live on among the ruins of our cities, dams, all our proud structures. Another way of visualizing it would be to imagine what people would be like if the cultured continue to have smaller and smaller families while the hopelessly ignorant, the morons, the heredity-tainted, the people most ridden with inherited diseases and most prone to crime, continue to have large families and finally almost supplant the healthier stock. Unless legislation is passed to support rather than suppress birth control and we apply eugenics to mankind, we are headed straight for dark ages for intellect darker than were the so-called Dark Ages.

But lest we form too dismal a picture of the future, let us think of the really dark ages. The darkest ages were the ages before history began, the ages when the only life on the earth was vegetable, the later ages when gigantic armored beasts ruled the earth. The death of the dinosaurs proved that mere strength is of very little service, a lesson our clamorers for large armies and navies or any armies and navies at all have yet to learn: the futility in the long run of might. It is a pity that some dinosaurs did not survive to be teachers to advocates of a "preparedness" which prepares for war, not peace, hate, not love, might, not

right, force, not justice between nations and races and also between social and industrial groups.

Prehistoric apes started to stand on their hind legs always and sit down instead of swinging from branches of trees and grow into men such a short time ago if you substitute a clock that tells the centuries for one that records only the minutes. Try to imagine eternity and infinity to put yourself in the right mood for understanding history. Man as we know him and represent him today has lived barely more than a hundred generations or so. The earth is two billion years old. For only three hundred million years has there been life on the earth—and there is no proof of there being life anywhere else in all the star-lit universe. For a mere matter of three hundred thousand years has man been on this one little star in the whole vast. Biology proves that all nature changes, evolution being not only change but change for the better. Psychology proves that human nature changes, and can be made to change for the better. Astronomy proves that we should not speak of "this old earth" but of "this *young* earth." For Sir James Jeans assures us that unless some gigantic shooting star bumps into the earth or the sun and destroys the earth or puts out our source of light and warmth, the earth will probably harbor life for a million million more years.

Our descendants of far-off ages, looking down the long vista of time from the other end (he states) will see our present age as the misty morning of the world's history; our contemporaries of today will appear as dim heroic figures who fought their way through jungles of ignorance, error and superstition to discover truth, to learn how to harness the forces of nature, and to make a world worthy for mankind to live in.

In brief, cheer up; there's plenty of time ahead of us yet! Time enough even to learn to apply the Golden Rule and live together in harmony and unselfishness!

We spoke of civilizations being built. They aren't built! They grow. But we must help them grow. It takes time. But it also takes us, each one of us, thinking less about ourselves as individuals and more about the great process of which we are a part, caring less how others affect us than how we affect others. If one contrasts hopes with fulfillments, all men are failures. But man need not be a failure. If one complains of life, what is meant is lives, usually just one's own. Life has succeeded so far. We have climbed upward despite the shadows.

But let us return—fortunately, just in thought—to the Dark Ages. Rather, as most of us recognize plants by the flowers more readily than by the stems, let us survey the handicaps under which humanity struggled in the Dark Ages behind us by studying what grew out of them. It may help us face the dark ages ahead of us—or that will be ahead of us if we do not improve our social and economic relations in time to avert them. History has been described as a race between intelligence and catastrophe, and almost everyone of intelligence agrees that at present the winner seems to be catastrophe. History is a stream, not a series of isolated pools. The Dark Ages were called "dark ages" because historians knew so little about them. They know more now. But let us follow the Biblical advice and judge the tree of history by its fruits. In other words, let's change the question with which we started, "What made the Dark Ages dark?" to "What put the *evil* in *medieval?*"

What were the shadows cast across man's path? Chief among them were the shadows of Gothic cathedrals and baronial castles. Those two evil mated couples: Superstition and Intolerance, Poverty and Brutality.

To understand these shadows and all shadows, we must realize that there cannot be shadows without light. To make our understanding of these shadows help us, we must be willing to see where they extend even if it be into our own rooms now. To overcome them, we must be fully aware that we cannot sweep shadows away or cut them to pieces or legislate them out of existence. The only cure for shadows is more light.

Alchemy was superstition, and the mother of chemistry. Astrology was superstition, and the mother of astronomy. The search for the Philosopher's Stone that would transmute baser metals into gold was the depth of the absurd from one angle—and it is the height of all that is not absurd from another. For what is science and art and religion itself but the effort to direct and further evolution and transfiguration and develop what is base into what is noble? Is not democracy no love of the debased classes but such an intolerance of them that one burns to wipe them out, raising the individuals now in them to health, intelligence, comfort and joy? The Philosopher's Stone remains a symbol of all that is most worthy of man's attention from the school to the church. Nothing is wrong with the rudest symbol. What is vital is: Do we recognize it as only a symbol, do we use it as a touchstone or a ball-and-chain? There are plenty of such Philosopher's Stones today from national flags to the red flag, from national constitutions to the Cross.

No shadow was blacker or more blighting than that of the Inquisition—and yet in all sincerity upon one of its earliest banners was emblazoned, *"Misericordia et Justitia."* Few institutions had higher motives, and few have better proved that "good intentions pave the road to hell."

"There is no justification for violence and injury, for religion cannot be imposed by force . . . there is no union possible between truth and violence, justice and cruelty." No, this is not a quotation from a rebel churchman of today denouncing the blasphemy represented by Christian churches blessing arms, praying for war victories other than victory over war and countenancing army chaplainships. It is a statement by Lactantus in his *"Divinae Institutiones,"* written in 308 A. D. Even later than the middle of the fourth century all the Church Fathers rejected the death penalty, declared that the Church had a horror of bloodshed, that faith must be free and the conscience a domain where no violence must enter. The Inquisition proved that man needs to remember almost as much as he needs to learn, perhaps even almost as much as he needs to learn to forget. And another proof of that fact that what is later in time may not be more advanced in development is the modern states' attitude toward Conscientious Objectors. The earlier Church Fathers would have excommunicated those who tortured our C. O.'s in Leavenworth and elsewhere.

But the Inquisition thought it was doing a kindness to those it tortured, a better excuse than the inquisitors of today have. Who would not prefer to be tortured for a few moments rather than to be tortured for all eternity? And that was the issue. For Heaven, Hell and Purgatory seemed to those behind the Inquisition right around the corner, as real to them as Wall Street is to us—and the Devil fully as active. True, if Christianity be mercy, forgiveness, love and living the Golden Rule, their God needed to be converted to Christianity. But their God who would damn all heretics to hell, making it their duty to combat heresy at any cost, remains the God of the Funda-

mentalists today. He hasn't grown up a bit, not yet outgrown jealously and revenge, not grown any kinder, although many men have far outstripped him in the Christian virtues, gaining a nobler conception of Deity, a profounder and more tolerant and humble reverence.

Few saints have a more affectionate place in the esteem of even agnostics than St. Francis. Yet it was through the Franciscans and Dominicans largely that the Inquisition came into being, a fact it is fortunate that the gentle St. Francis was spared from knowing. It arose largely as an attempt to combat the corruption of the clergy, a corruption caused partly by the fact that special privileges granted the clergy attracted self-seekers into holy orders. Monasteries were often feudal castles and bishops warred upon each other as did barons. But the instrument of reform became vastly more harmful than the corruption it sought to cure. The Inquisition cut the population of Spain in two centuries from twenty million to six million, and nearly destroyed all it was designed to save. Thus it proved what war proves: Force fails. It showed that institutions must be judged by their effects, not by their ostensible motives or the moral qualities of their founders or personnel.

Give any foothold to intolerance and soon there is no room for anything else to stand. To question the justice of an inquisitor became heresy; to eat food sold or prepared by a heretic was heresy or to enter a house where a heretic lived—a position almost as absurd as considering that possession of Communist literature constitutes criminal revolution, an act for which more than one man is in jail in the United States today. In 1244 A. D. (and in this case A. D. may well stand for "Age of Darkness"!) the testimony before the Inquisition of a ten-year-old child was enough to convict his father, sister and seventy other people of heresy. In the year of the dark ages, 1933, Tom Mooney is still in prison, although every witness against him has confessed or been proved to be a perjurer. But the world does advance! The martyr to truth, Guido Bruno, was burned at the stake. The martyrs to brotherhood, Sacco and Vanzetti, recently were burned in an electric chair. The actual punishment of the victims of the Inquisition was inflicted by the secular authorities obeying the wealthy Church. It is inflicted now by the secular authorities obeying the wealthy Corporations. Then the punishment was to save souls. Now it is to save money for capitalists. . . . Or isn't this progress?

No measures were too strong for the Inquisition to take to extort confession from those suspected of heresy. Men and women were tortured by being stretched on a wheel to wring a confession from their bleeding lips. And men are now tortured by the third degree to make them confess by a very large proportion of city police departments. From the rack to the rubber hose is the measure of progress from the age of gargoyled cathedrals to the age of skyscrapers.

The Inquisition spawned an even fouler and more destructive shadow, a shadow we associate with Halloween jollity, the shadow of an old woman riding a broomstick. But to say this is to be unfair to witches. The shadow should rather be that of the witch-baiters who put poor and friendless old women to death on the charge of witchcraft, accusing them of black magic which ranged from turning milk sour to inflicting barrenness and eating new-born babies.

But do not blame witchcraft on the Dark Ages. It was not until 1484 that Pope Innocent VIII issued the Papal Bull which launched this savagery that within three centuries claimed nine and a half million victims, more than the number of soldiers killed in all European wars from the birth of the Prince of Peace down until the Great War revealed new possibilities of wholesale murder. As late as the ninth century the Canon Episcopi of Ancyra were commanded "energetically to combat in their dioceses the belief in the possibility of demoniacal magic and night journeys to or with demons as being pure illusion." But the low opinion which the Church held of women, debating whether they had souls or were merely beasts, paved the way—and few churches yet admit women to an ecclesiastical equality with men.

Perhaps even more fundamental was the Church's insistence upon regarding sex as a sin rather than as a sacrament, degrading and repressing rather than spiritualizing it. In this attitude there has been little change to date. Witches (?) have been officially executed in Germany and Poland within the last two centuries, lynched in England and France within the last century and threatened in Germany and the United States within the last five years. But, chiefly due to Catholic and other Fundamentalist influence, women today by the many thousand annually in this country are tortured, killed or their lives made miserable by having the knowledge of birth control measures held from them and being forced to bear children they should not have to bear. Lack of respect for sex and womanhood bore the evil fruit of witch-persecution. It continues to bear the more widespread and, therefore, more damning fruit of forced maternity.

Black cats are associated with witches, but a more suitable animal would be the goat, the scapegoat. From savages' blood-sacrifices and the sin-eaters of the Welsh to the blaming of bank failures last summer on those whom Hoover so erroneously called "Communists and other criminals," man always wants a scapegoat. The outbreaks of witchcraft hysteria which swept Europe in a series of epidemics sprang in part from this preference for finding a butt to finding a why.

One reason why more witches than wizards were persecuted was that so many men were killed in wars and in the Crusades that women became dissatisfied, rivalry rioted rampant and sheer spite gave rise to gossip and gossip to overt accusations. As torture was used, anyone accused could in time be made to appear guilty or even plead guilty. In Geneva during three months in 1515 five hundred witches were condemned to death. In Germany between 1610 and 1660 there were more than one hundred thousand convictions. More than thirty thousand men and women were killed in England for witchcraft. Sadism flourished. Witch-hunting became a sport similar to the Palmer raids, the Fish Committee, D. A. R., Ku Klux Klan and other examples of red-baiting today. Even children younger than ten were burned to death as witches. Witchcraft hysteria was worse in credulous, drudgery-ridden, ignorant and poverty-stricken communities of the type which today indulge most in lynching.

Perhaps the most peculiar fact about witchcraft was the detailed confession of multitudes of witches. They plead guilty to being brides of the Devil just as nuns consider themselves the brides of Christ. They confessed with a wealth of description flying to Black Mass on broomsticks or on men they turned into horses. Lecky has said, "If we considered witchcraft probable, a hundredth part of the evidence we possess would have placed it beyond the region of doubt." Many defendants are executed now on much flimsier circumstantial evidence. Undoubtedly, many of the

witches were mental defectives whose own imaginations got the best of them. People are prone to become what others think them, to accept thought patterns formed for them. This fact has yet to make us realize the value of thinking the best we can of others and giving them the benefit of the doubt, as not only brutal methods of penology testify and the willingness of the public to swallow the most fantastic stories of enemy "atrocities" which the press can concoct but also our own daily lives.

Indeed, the fear of witches was not overcome by evidence against the possibility of witchcraft. People are still willing to believe things which are far more fantastic such as that armaments lead to peace, that the profit-motive conduces to the greatest happiness of all and that we can outgrow dark ages before we lay aside forever militarism and capitalism. It was faith, not reason, which brought an end to belief in witchcraft, a slight increase of faith in ourselves and in each other. It is not enough for science to prove facts. It is necessary for education and literature and religion to make the world believe the facts. It is not enough to prove error. It is requisite to supply a truer, kinder faith.

Superstition and sorcery concepts spring from dreams by night or day and these nightmares must be left behind through a clearer understanding of the sources from which dreams spring, through a better understanding of our own selves if we are to escape from recurrences of such evils. We must welcome new facts, new ideas, afford freedom of speech and press for any ideas however outrageous they may appear to us, if we are to overcome the dangers of the world within us and of the world around us.

We no longer live in walled towns, although we still live behind high tariff walls, but most of us live in walled minds.

Even such a brief survey as this of the Dark Ages behind us and a glimpse at the dark age in which we now stand can lead us to but one conclusion that the only way to escape dark ages before us is to determine that the Dark Ages must be limited to the era between Christ and Gandhi by our following what both have taught: Peace on Earth, Good Will to Men and Non-Resistance. It took several centuries after the crucifixion of Christ for the Roman Empire to fall. The Empire of Organized Greed is crumbling while Gandhi still lives. Christ's message has gone largely in vain so far. Let us now make His message and Gandhi's usher in the Bright Ages!

RALPH CHEYNEY.

The Study Table

Joseph Chamberlain: First Phase

And still the mocking Victorian pageant continues! For now the gifted editor of "These Eventful Years" proceeds to reconstruct with his nimble pen those just preceding; and, upon the canvas thus created, he evokes (for our obvious discomfiture) one of the towering colossi of that cyclopean period: Joseph Chamberlain.* Painted with flowing supple strokes and quicksilver wit, he strides his hour: philosophical, and yet no ideologue; mutinous, and yet no Marat; business-minded, and yet no dull industrialist. Instead, like some middle-class Caesar of the industrial revolution, he stalks alone, remote, aloof, ironical—at once imaginative and methodical—dramatic as no other English revolutionary since Cromwell.

To follow his long career across those varied scenes would be impossible—and, indeed, only half of it is here presented. Some sketch of its general outlines, however, may be attempted, together with a brief review of its outstanding events. Maltster, ironworker, shoemaker in antecedents, he first emerges from a somewhat cloistered school life to aid in amassing the family fortune at Birmingham, with which his name is forever to be identified. Bursting buds of imperialism appear in him at this time, as do those of social reform among the masses—the whole mellowed and matured by a happy marriage and a brutal bereavement. A considerable interlude follows: not until after thirty does he enter politics adroitly as a Liberal in Birmingham, storm center of proletarian agitation, already seething to the aroused oratory of Bright.

An educational league for the workers marks his first effort on their behalf in the field of practical politics. Promptly this places him in the city council and brings him over the Universal Education Bill to a titanic clash with Gladstone. Defeated at first onset, the young agitator masses his myriads, and eventually, together with innumerable other allies, worries the harassed Woodman to his fall. But by this time Chamberlain's pedagogical platform has become moribund: forthwith he discards it and casts about him for another, embracing more mass solidarity, upon which to challenge the powers that be—and forward his own personal prestige! He finds it; and henceforth his Jacobin war-cry, "Free Church, Free Schools, Free Land, and Free Labor," (never tinctured with radical Republicanism) resounds throughout the land for fourteen years. Prestige and the precious friendship of Lord Morley now come to him. But an abortive stand for Parliament (retired from his business as its Rockefeller) plunges him back into his municipal reforms, which are to occupy him continuously for the next five years as Mayor of Birmingham—"the greatest executive of the nineteenth century." With his Cromwellian word, "In twelve months by God's help the town shall not know itself," he carries through a regimen of reforms whose roster is still one of the greatest English glories: municipal control of gas, creation of sewage and water systems, slum clearance and rebuilding, erection of avenues and squares, regulation of the liquor traffic—all this without impoverishing the town treasury, but, on the contrary, by progressively replenishing it, and erecting, where had stood a huddle of houses medieval as London under Henry VII, a modern city surpassing in its splendors anything in the civilized world. Then, at the apex of his power, another deadly blow: a second bereavement. Crushed to earth, Chamberlain temporarily resigns the mace and retires to wage his inner struggle, until, victorious, he emerges once more, this time into the larger vistas of national politics.

From this time on his destiny merges with that of England; and a whole procession of startling and spectacular events pass through it: the Balkan revolt, rising in steady crescendo to the Turkish crisis and the Treaty of Berlin; the daring victories of Chamberlain's creation, the Caucus, in the field of English political organization; the downfall of Disraeli; Cham-

*"The Life of Joseph Chamberlain," Vol. I, by J. L. Garvin. Published by Macmillan. $5.00.

berlain's presidency of the Board of Trade, touching the extremities of the British Empire; the Patents Act; the franchise reform; the Income Tax; the Egyptian occupation; the Irish entanglement and Gladstone's overthrow—the sinister storm clouds of the Boer War growing ever darker over the horizon of the Eighteen-eighties.

All these events—and many more of lesser import—help to crowd Mr. Garvin's canvas, which even now is but half completed. Enough has been done, nevertheless, to provide a very personable picture of the Carnot of English Liberalism at the height of his power; and to arouse enthusiasm for his boundless energy, his Dantonesque audacity, his gay gallantry, his purity of soul—perhaps even to provoke pity, too, for the restless poet confined within the casque of Cromwell, striving ever, amid the storm and stress of those outward vestments, for the peace and repose that he passionately desired.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

English Radio Talks

This book* interests us greatly from two separate points of view.

In the first place, it contains a series of radio talks delivered to the British public by the B. B. C. (British Broadcasting Corporation). As a sample of what radio means in England, it is of immense significance to American "listeners-in." It may be said, of course, that in this country too we have radio features of this sort. And so we do—once in a great while! But the important thing is that addresses of this type and calibre are the rule in Great Britain, while here they are the exception. Think of it! Here was a series of addresses spoken one a week, each a half-hour long, over a period of sixteen weeks, by scholarly experts on topics of vital international import. How often do *we* get anything of this kind? Not often! And when perchance we do, the feature is sponsored by some private advertiser who insists upon cluttering up the broadcast with unctious commendations of his cigarettes, gasoline, or tooth-paste. The British radio exists and functions in an altogether different world from ours. It is a public institution maintained for high-class instruction and entertainment, whereas our various private companies are maintained for profit.

In the second place, this book interests us because of the exceptional timeliness and value of its contents. It opens with four talks on Germany by Harrison Brown, the accomplished English correspondent of our own paper, UNITY. These are followed by a similar number of talks on France by E. L. Woodward. Russia is presented in the same number of talks by Arnold J. Toynbee; and the United States by S. K. Ratcliffe, best known and most admired of all English lecturers in this country. All the talks are planned on the basis of a combination of history and contemporary events, the former given in each case is a kind of background for the latter. They are as charming to read as they must have been to hear. The easy and informal conversational method of exposition is scrupulously preserved—only Ratcliffe's material has been rewritten to any extent! English platform-speakers are masters of this direct, personal, interpretative style of speech, and the authors of this volume measure well up to standard.

Mr. Brown's chapters on Germany fittingly hold first place in the book, as Germany itself holds first place in world attention. When delivered as radio talks, they were right up to the minute, and represent a marvellously clear and comprehensive survey of an essentially chaotic scene. It is not Mr. Brown's fault that the first and furious sweep of events in the Reich has already dated certain of his pages, while at the same time fulfilling accurately his forecasts. Arnold Toynbee's talks on Russia seem to us to be a model of expository approach to a subject necessarily alien from the sympathies of the majority of his hearers. It is the most lucid opening up of the subject of the Soviets we have ever seen. As for Ratcliffe's study of the United States, it leaves an American baffled that he must turn to a foreigner for an understanding of his country which he has never had in such perfect clarity himself. E. L. Woodward has a less likable subject, but he keeps easily and ably the pace set by his colleagues.

All in all, a book to do the heart good! So long as popular education of this kind is available, there is hope for our world.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

*"Our Neighbors Today and Yesterday" (Germany, France, Russia, the United States). Published by Gerald Howe, Ltd., London, England. Six shillings.

Correspondence

The Humanist Manifesto

Editor of UNITY:

I was deeply interested in that "Humanist Manifesto" in UNITY of May 29th, but failed to see where they have offered anything better or said anything new.

They say "The time has passed for theism, deism, etc." Why?

"No God, no soul, no life to come,
No will beyond man's will.
Nothing that reasoning can plumb
But vast unreason still.
And this—The summit of the known
Man—sitting on a madhouse throne."

"Nothing human is alien to the religious. . . . The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained." Nearly two thousand years ago Christ taught that all human relationships were sacred, so much so that all we do of good or evil to the least and lowest we do unto God. "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these my brethren ye did it unto me."

"Religious humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfilment in the here and now." Most if not all Christ's teaching was for the here and now. The last commandment that he gave to his disciples before his death covered all possible human relationships. "That ye love one another as I have loved you."

"The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good." Christ said that was the chief aim of life and that we should strive with all our power to bring it about. "When ye pray, pray thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as in heaven."

"Man at last is becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that he has within himself the power of its achievement." Christ said, "When ye pray say Our Father." He did not tell us to repeat it as a matter of form. He stated it as a fact. Then "I am a spirit issued from the Supreme Spirit, consequently I am eternal and I possess in small all the

properties and capacities of my origin, they are in me in a semidormant state."

Moreover Christ's command was, "Follow me." If it was not possible for him to sin then it was no merit for him not to have sinned. If he used power to overcome evil that is not available to man then he is of no inspiration to man.

"Yet, Jesus, whatever else he is over and above, is without meaning to me. . . . If Jesus was not one of us, and if his way of life is not wide open to me. His daring calls for my daring I hear his voice 'Follow me.'"

Why should we cast aside the search for a better and truer God, because in our blindness we have misunderstood God and his message? "But the so-called Christian faith as embodied in the creeds and organized in the churches, must be cast aside as a superstition and the religion of Jesus restored to the simple love and brotherhood of the Jew of Galilee."

Howell, Mich. JOHN T. RICKETT.

Hitler an Idealist!

Editor of UNITY:

Be so good as not to send me UNITY any more for the present. There have been notes and articles about this country in it recently which are most distressing and certainly highly exaggerated accounts of measures taken against the Jewish population here.

Parliamentarism had become impossible by the action of the Communists, and a strong hand alone could save the country from chaos. Mistakes no doubt have been made here and there, but Hitler is an idealist and is trying to do his best.

GERTRUDE VON PETZOLD*.

The University, Frankfort, Germany.

*Miss von Petzold is a well-known religious liberal. On a visit to this country, she preached in many Unitarian and other pulpits. The office reports that she "has been on the free list for many years."—Editor.

The Field

(Continued from page 278)

the imperialist nations, especially by Britain and Japan. These countries have, in the first place, no business to be in other peoples' territories; and if they are there, no peace plan inspired by America or even by God Almighty may lend validity to their unjust occupation of other lands—certainly, no peace plan may guarantee to them immunity from aggression, attack or violence on the part of those who seek their freedom. Believing as I do in the Gandhi program and principle of non-violent resistance, I still reserve to my country the right to attain her freedom by violent means, if necessary. The possibility of armed conflict between exploiting and exploited nations would be entirely averted by an extension of your principle as suggested in the preceding paragraph. The sending of "no armed force of whatsoever nature across their frontiers" means that nations that have already armed forces stationed in other lands should be, by virtue of your peace plan, obliged to withdraw such armed forces from across their frontiers in a manner to be prescribed by an international body of experts.

The world's hope in American leadership has been best expressed by Mahatma Gandhi, the twentieth century evangel of peace on earth and good-will among men. Says this modern apostle of *Ahimsa* (non-violence: love):

"My message to American Christians on world peace and disarmament is that Peace and Disarmament are not a matter of reciprocity. When real Peace and Disarmament come, they will be initiated by a strong nation like America irrespective of the consent and cooperation of other nations.

"An individual or a nation must have faith in oneself and in the protective power of God to find peace in the midst of strife, and to shed all arms by reason of feeling the loving power of God and His protective shield, and I hold such peace to be impossible so long as strong nations do not consider it to be sinful to exploit weak nations."

Already this young nation has pointed the right way in many directions. Humanity is indebted to America for the following American contributions and inventions: (1) the public school system, (2) the public library system, (3) the endowment of scientific research institutions, (4) the technique of mass production (Ford), (5) electrification (Edison), (6) the technique of democracy.

America's mission, I am convinced, is to lay the foundation for a warless world even as it is India's mission to demonstrate the spirit necessary for the evolving of a warless world.

It is my fervent hope that America, through you, may promote world peace in this generation. Sincerely yours,

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

New York, N. Y.

Don't Fail to Read These Booklets!
Just Off the Press

Let's Be Square: Checkmating Russian Ballyhoo
(An exposé of some recent articles published about Russia)

Bugaboos: Facts About Popular Superstitions
(Looking into the origins of popular superstitions)

5 Cents Each (Postage 1c extra per copy)

Written and Published by

Russell Wright, Forest Avenue, Hammond, Indiana

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

New and Revised Edition

INDIA IN BONDAGE

by JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Brought Strictly Up-to-Date—8 New Chapters on

The Momentous Events of the Last Two Years in England and India—India's Future—Will Gandhi Win?—Will There be a Bloody Revolution?—Is the New Constitution which Britain is Forging for India, a CHARTER OF FREEDOM, or a STEEL FRAME OR STRONGER BONDAGE?

$2.00 at All Bookstores or Direct from

LEWIS COPELAND COMPANY, 570 Lexington Ave., New York